

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The examiner has disagreed concerning the election of species and withdrawn Claims 39-44 in addition to Claims 1-20. Thus, Claims 21-38 and 46-47 are subject to this official action.

The examiner objects to Claim 28 because of a typographical error therein. This claim has been amended accordingly.

The examiner rejects Claims 37-38 and 46-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Pavelchek. The examiner rejects Claims 37-38 and 46-47 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Oettinger et al. The examiner rejects Claims 37-38 and 46-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Oettinger et al. '435. The examiner rejects Claims 21, 29-30, 37-38 and 46-47 under 35 U.S.C. as being unpatentable over Cheng. The examiner objects to Claims 22-28 and 31-36 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Accordingly, Applicants have combined Claims 21 and 22 to produce an allowable Claim and cancelled Claim 22 without prejudice. Claims 23-27 are dependent directly or indirectly from this claim and are therefore in condition for allowance. Claim 28, as amended to correct the typographically error, is similarly in condition for allowance. With respect to Claims 29 and 30, Applicants believe that the claims are now in condition for allowance since Claim 21 has been combined with Claim 22 in to produce an allowable Claim 21 from which Claim 29 is dependent and Claim 30 is dependent upon Claim 29. Accordingly, Applicants believe these claims should be in condition for allowance as well. In view of the fact that Claim 31 is dependent from Claim 29, the patentablility of Claim 29 having been shown above, this claim is patentable for the same reasons. Accordingly, Claims 29-31 have not been amended.

Applicants have combined Claims 21 and 32 to produce an allowable Claim with Claims 33-36 being indicated as allowable by the examiner. Applicants have cancelled withdrawn Claims 1-20 and 39-45 without prejudice of filing a divisional application.

Claims 37-38 and 46-47 have been cancelled.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Instruments Incorporated

/William B Kempler/

William B. Kempler

Senior Corporate Patent Counsel

Reg. No. 28,228

Tel.: (972) 917-5452